

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

COMMITTEE MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
SPECIAL WASTE COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA, JR., CALEPA BUILDING
1001 I STREET
2ND FLOOR
COASTAL HEARING ROOM
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 9, 2006

10:00 A.M.

TIFFANY C. KRAFT, CSR, RPR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 12277

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Ms. Margo Reid Brown, Chair

Ms. Rosalie Mul

Mr. Gary Petersen

BOARD MEMBER ALSO PRESENT

Ms. Cheryl Peace

Ms. Patricia Wiggins

STAFF

Mr. Mark Leary, Executive Director

Ms. Julie Nauman, Chief Deputy Director

Mr. Stephen Binning, Staff

Mr. Elliot Block, Staff Counsel

Ms. Kristen Garner, Executive Assistant

Mr. Nate Gauff, Staff

Mr. Chris Schmidle, Staff

Ms. Kristin Yee, Supervisor, Used Oil Recycling Analysis

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

iii

INDEX

	PAGE
Roll Call And Declaration Of Quorum	1
Public Comment	2
A. Deputy Director's Report	
B. Consideration Of The Grant Awards For The Household Hazardous Waste Grants (15th Cycle) (Integrated Waste Management Account, FY 2006/07) -- (August Board Item 1)	6
C. Consideration Of Grant Awards For The Targeted Rubberized Asphalt Concrete Incentive Grant Program (Tire Recycling Management Fund, FY 2006/07) -- (August Board Item 2)	24
D. PULLED Consideration Of Grant Awards For The Tire-Derived Product Business Assistance Program (Tire Recycling Management Fund, FY 2006/07) -- (August Board Item 3)	
E. Adjournment	28
F. Reporter's Certificate	29

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Good morning, and welcome to
3 the Special Waste Committee meeting.

4 There are agendas in the back of the room on the
5 table. And if anyone would like to speak, there are
6 speaker slips. And you can bring them over to Kristen,
7 Kristen Garner over here. And I just want to mention if
8 you could turn your cell phones down to the vibrate mode
9 and pagers as well, turn them off, especially if you
10 intend to speak during the Committee.

11 Due to a title change on Committee Item D, Board
12 Item 3, this will be presented at the full Board meeting
13 for consideration at our August 15th Board meeting.

14 Kristen, can you please call the roll?

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Members Mulé?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Here.

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Petersen?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER PETERSEN: Here.

19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Brown?

20 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Here.

21 And I would like to acknowledge Board Members
22 Wiggins and Peace who have joined us as well.

23 Members have any ex partes to report?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: I'm up to date, Madam
25 Chair.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PETERSEN: Madam Chair, I'm up
2 to date.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: We're up to date.

4 Kristin Yee is going to be doing the Deputy
5 Director's Report today.

6 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: Good morning. For
7 the record, Kristin Yee, Acting Branch Manager for the
8 Special Waste Division. And I'm sitting in for Jim Lee
9 while he's on vacation.

10 For the Deputy Director's report, I'm pleased to
11 announce on August 1st, 2006, a recycled paint standard
12 was agreed upon unanimously by stakeholders in the Product
13 Stewardship Institute, PSI, national paint dialogue. This
14 group of stakeholders are made up of managers, recyclers,
15 and government representatives. They approved a Green
16 Seal standard for recycled content paint that will ensure
17 buyers that the paint is environmentally preferable and
18 meets the same standard as other high quality paint.

19 The work involved in establishing this paint
20 standard was primarily funded through one of our HHW
21 grants to San Joaquin County with some funding provided by
22 the State of Washington and Dunn-Edwards Paint.

23 The next phase to be completed includes testing
24 of specific recycled paint guides for inclusion in
25 recycled paint that meets the Green Seal standard.

1 Testing will be completed in the spring of 2007,
2 and we are working with both Department of General
3 Services and Caltrans who are supportive of the standard
4 to encourage State agencies to purchase recycled paint.
5 And in fact, DGS is planning to issue a management memo
6 concerning the standard and State procurement of recycled
7 content paint. Caltrans said they're going to be
8 promoting recycled paint procurement in all of theirs.
9 That was good news.

10 That pretty much concludes the Deputy Director's
11 report. And unless there are comments or questions, I'll
12 continue with today's agenda.

13 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Anybody have any questions?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: I just want to
15 congratulate staff on a job well done in getting the
16 standard approved. I know it was a long process. And
17 appreciate your efforts. Thank you.

18 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: I do want to
19 recognize Glenn Gallagher, because he has been a big --
20 very instrumental in the PSI conference and pushing the
21 paint standard and working with them.

22 So the first one is Committee Item B, Board Item
23 1, is Consideration of the Grant Awards for the Household
24 Hazardous Waste Grants 15th Cycle, Integrated Waste
25 Management Account, Fiscal Year 2006-07.

1 And we are pleased to bring forth this item today
2 because it is a keystone in the implementation of the
3 Board's Universal Waste Action Plan. The Board focused on
4 criteria which the Board approved in February 2006 to
5 support u-waste collection for this particular grant cycle
6 in recognition of the sunseting of the temporary
7 exemption of households to dispose of universal waste in
8 landfills. So effective February 9th, 2006, DTSC allowed
9 exemptions to expire. So the criteria for this grant
10 cycle allows for the maximum funding to assist local
11 jurisdictions with their u-waste collection and recycling
12 efforts.

13 It has a unique fund set aside for planning and
14 coordination grants to encourage and facilitate discussion
15 of u-waste issues by regional jurisdictions. And several
16 of the grantees recommended for awards initiate and
17 support what we call a take-back program in cooperation
18 with retail partners. Hopefully, it will provide a
19 foundation for future expansion and public support of the
20 concept of retail take back, product stewardship, and
21 ultimately manufacturer responsibility.

22 And before I ask Steve Binning and Chris Schmidle
23 to make the remainder of the staff presentation, I want to
24 bring to your attention the Resolution you have before you
25 that has been revised to reflect a typo and to correct a

1 nominal change in the proposed grant recipient.

2 Steve.

3 MR. BINNING: Good morning. We've had some Power
4 Point issues with the building, so hopefully you were able
5 to grab a hard copy.

6 This is grant awards for the 15th cycle. HHW
7 grants, you know, they're made available for local
8 jurisdictions and including tribes. Our focus was on
9 establishing or expanding HHW collection. You know, we
10 always give statutory priority for rural areas which is a
11 county under 200,000 or for small cities under 35,000.
12 And also for multi-jurisdictionals.

13 This year which I believe is unique is we had
14 kind of two sets. We had a u-waste coordination set and
15 the usual infrastructure side. You want to mention
16 anything on the coordination side, Chris?

17 MR. SCHMIDLE: No. The idea of the coordination
18 grant was to help counties do coordinated planning for
19 u-waste. In our information exchanges, we've gone down
20 and asked people, you know, what are you doing about
21 u-waste? And we're not getting a whole lot of answers.
22 And this is an opportunity for us to try to develop more
23 uniform policies, ordinances, and this sort of thing and
24 get the best practices going on a county wide level. So
25 it's an innovative program. We don't know if it's going

1 to work, but we're going to give it a try and see how it
2 goes.

3 MR. BINNING: We received 34 applications
4 representing 35 counties for the u-waste coordination
5 side.

6 Back to the infrastructure side, you know, this
7 year, you know, we had something unique is they can use
8 money to design their facilities, kind of stretch out the
9 amount. I guess it was unreasonable amounts of time to
10 design, finish, and complete a facility within a grant
11 period. So we did have some proposals to do just that.
12 And also to expand facilities to accommodate u-waste.
13 And also what we're calling our innovative u-waste
14 collection opportunities which is our partnerships.

15 For the infrastructure, we received 42 complete
16 applications, which is -- I went back. That's the most we
17 received in the last three or four years requesting just
18 over \$9 million. Twenty-one applications received a
19 passing score of at least 70. And those passing scores
20 requested 4.5 million. We had approximately 4.2 million
21 left after the infrastructure or the coordination side to
22 disburse. We have 19 for funding. One of those is
23 partial funding.

24 For kind of generalized, approximately about
25 two-thirds of the projects are take it back or some form

1 of a take it back partnership. And about one-third are
2 for either expanding to accommodate u-waste, the building
3 of a facility, designing of facility infrastructure
4 projects.

5 The coordination sides, they were not competitive
6 grants. Since we complete the application, submit your
7 paperwork, we had a set amount of how much each county
8 could receive depending on population. And if we had set
9 500,000 aside and they requested 309, approximately,
10 thousand, the rest of the funds we moved over to the
11 infrastructure side. We do have two Resolutions for you
12 today. One is for the grant awards for the infrastructure
13 side, and the other is the coordination side.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Thank you.

15 Do we have any questions from Board members?

16 Member Wiggins.

17 BOARD MEMBER WIGGINS: Where will the money come
18 from to help finish the funding for San Diego?

19 MR. BINNING: Currently -- I did call San Diego.
20 I told them that we had -- they did receive a passing
21 score. We are out of our allotment of funds. I said
22 currently we can recommend approximately -- I think they
23 have requested 250,000, and we're able to fund as it
24 stands 150,000 of that. They were fine with that. I had
25 a couple calls with them over the last few weeks. They

1 were happy to have been awarded or recommended for
2 awarding a grant. So they would -- to answer your
3 question, I'm sorry. They would use their own funds.

4 BOARD MEMBER WIGGINS: But it says if the funding
5 is available, San Diego would get the 96,0000.

6 MR. BINNING: That is correct. If another
7 awardee above them decides not to accept the grant, some
8 other funding becomes available, we would fund the
9 remainders of the San Diego award before moving down the
10 line.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Is this a grant that can be
12 awarded or completed through reallocation?

13 MR. BINNING: Can you answer that?

14 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR LEARY: Madam Chair, I think
15 that's possible. This is originally IWMA money. So to
16 the extent there's any IWMA money available at the end of
17 the year, I think we can redirect it in this way if it was
18 viewed by the Board as being a top priority.

19 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: For whatever reason a
20 grant agreement may not be signed or where it turns out
21 we're monitoring them, they're not meeting the project or
22 downsizing the project, they don't need the funds and the
23 funds come back to us, it will be allocated to the next
24 one in line that's eligible who passed. And it will be
25 San Diego and the remaining two who passed. Because 21

1 applicants actually had a passing score, but we only had
2 enough funds to award 19.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

4 Any other questions?

5 Member Peace.

6 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: I have some questions. I
7 hope you can answer them. If you can't, maybe you can
8 answer them at the full Board. And I know you have more
9 back up than what's in here, because you just gave us a
10 couple lines on what's going on here in these programs.

11 But I look at San Luis Obispo and the first one,
12 and they want to establish battery and florescent tube
13 take-it-back program at 215 locations for approximately
14 \$300,000. And then I look down at West Contra Costa
15 County, and apparently they have about the same population
16 as San Luis Obispo, and they want to add 20 new battery
17 collection centers for \$151,000. So unless there's more
18 in there that I don't see, 215 centers at \$300,000 is
19 about \$1300 a take-back center. Where with Contra Costa
20 County, 20 battery collection centers for 151 is about
21 \$7600 a take-back center. And I'm wondering why there is
22 such a difference there, you know. What is it I'm not
23 getting here?

24 MR. BINNING: I took a look at that after our
25 discussion yesterday kind of the -- I just kind of made a

1 little chart here. The difference I see in the West
2 Contra Costa one is they are only going after the larger
3 retail outlets, the Home Depots, Wal-Mart, those lines.
4 They're also going to be servicing these every two weeks,
5 where on the San Luis Obispo one they're going to be
6 servicing those pretty much on a quarterly basis is where
7 the cost difference was of just servicing them.

8 West Contra Costa anticipates collecting about
9 84,000 pounds of batteries in San Luis Obispo, about
10 double that. So I'm working on trying to figure out where
11 the price difference is, whether it's on the recycling
12 rates or the transportation rates on where the difference
13 is.

14 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: To me, it's such a big
15 difference that I don't know if you have any kind of a
16 cost analysis to see if they're correct in what they're
17 asking for to do this, to do the same thing.

18 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: You have to remember,
19 these applications is something they submit. It's based
20 on the cost they have estimated what they think their
21 project is going to be like. So we can only score based
22 on our criteria that was approved by you back in February.

23 So when we look at the budget, this seems
24 reasonable. If this is what they project they can
25 collect, we accept it, unless there's some duplication

1 when we look at budget, and we talk to the applicant about
2 it. Otherwise, when you look at each individual
3 applicant, you see what the difference is in terms of
4 whether they're in rural areas, urban areas, how often
5 they're collecting. All that they're taking into
6 consideration when they're submitting the application to
7 us. If you want us to actually go into more detail, we
8 can get back to you with more answer to get the breakdown
9 of what the actual project is to do the cost breakdown.

10 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: I understand there's
11 differences. But to me it seems there's such a -- maybe
12 they can take advice from San Luis Obispo and do it
13 cheaper.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Board Member Peace, I
15 think where you may be confused is the collection
16 frequency. I mean, if they're collecting every other week
17 in West Contra Costa County, there's a huge difference in
18 collecting every other week versus collecting once a
19 quarter. That's where they're incurring those costs. So
20 I'm sure staff and the applicant can sit down with you and
21 go over those costs in detail. But I mean, just from my
22 experience, off the top of my head that's where the
23 difference in cost is.

24 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: But we don't know whether
25 they need to pick up that often or how much. We just go

1 by what they say it's going to cost?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: I think it's based on
3 their needs in their community.

4 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: That's what they said
5 their need was.

6 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: They had the same
7 population. I just wonder why one need is so different.

8 MR. SCHMIDLE: This is best practices, yet this
9 is in essence an experiment. I think it's kind of useful
10 they're trying it two different ways. A lot of small
11 facilities being picked up once in a while versus in more
12 centralized facilities being picked up more frequently.
13 We really don't have a cost basis for us to be able to sit
14 down and say you're spending too much or too little
15 because there is so little known about u-waste collection.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: And there's nothing to say
17 once they start picking up every couple weeks if the need
18 isn't there they extend their collection to monthly or
19 quarterly after they have some experience under their
20 belt. And maybe they'll get some cost savings and can
21 share that with San Diego County.

22 MR. SCHMIDLE: And we will be going down through
23 our grant evaluation process and visiting with them and
24 see how the grants are working out. At that point if we
25 find out some more information, we can transfer that

1 practice to another county or another grantee.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Now that you mentioned it,
3 how often -- since this is a new grant, u-waste is new, we
4 don't have best practices through the grant evaluation
5 process. How frequently do you touch base with these
6 grantees?

7 MR. SCHMIDLE: Well, basically we have a
8 beginning and a mid and towards the end or final. But in
9 this case, we'll probably be going down more frequently
10 because it's a new idea.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: To all 19 of the grantees?

12 MR. SCHMIDLE: If possible, yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Like quarterly, annually?

14 MR. SCHMIDLE: What is beginning, mid, and end?

15 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: I think we brought it
16 before the Board before. We do these mid, beginning
17 cycles, mid-cycle reports so that we can kind of do an
18 analysis of where they're at with their project.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Tell me what is middle? Is
20 it six months, one-year cycle?

21 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: In a one year, it
22 will be on a every four months.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

24 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: Because it's a
25 one-year grant.

1 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Just tell me what the grant
2 is and tell me what mid is. That's all I need to know.

3 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: In the beginning,
4 we'll do an analysis and four months later we see how
5 they're doing.

6 MR. BINNING: That's the coordination side. The
7 infrastructure side is two and a half years.

8 MR. SCHMIDLE: It would be more like going down
9 every six months.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: I think at least for myself
11 and probably the rest of the Board, we'd be interested in
12 an update in a shorter time frame just as they get going
13 the first six months for all of them to make sure we know
14 where they are so we can gauge successes or challenges
15 they have in the infrastructure development or even the
16 planning.

17 MS. YEE: In between, staff is communicating with
18 them by phone, e-mail.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Thank you.

20 Do we have any other questions?

21 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: The only other questions,
22 since we're supposed to be focusing on infrastructure and
23 innovative partnership collections, I'm just wondering how
24 like in Delta Diablo paying for the increase in hours of
25 operation, how that falls under infrastructure or

1 partnerships. Is that normal for us to pay for the hours
2 of operation of a facility? And once we stop paying those
3 hours, will they go back to less hours, or do they have to
4 have something in place that shows they have funding to
5 continue those hours of operation?

6 MR. BINNING: I don't have the application in
7 front of me. I can get back to you on that. But as I
8 recall, the Delta Diablo, a major part of their funding
9 was building expansion.

10 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Which is good.

11 MR. BINNING: As I remember reviewing it, because
12 we actually had to revise their budget, a major portion of
13 that was the actual expansion of their facility to
14 accommodate u-waste.

15 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Which is fine. But the
16 hours of operation -- they're not paying their staff to
17 increase their hours of operation. I don't understand why
18 we'd be paying for that.

19 MR. SCHMIDLE: In some cases, jurisdictions like
20 to try things out, but they really don't want to try them
21 out with their own money. And in this case, I haven't
22 read it in detail and we will get that information for
23 you. But in many cases, they'd like to try out and see if
24 because of the increase in the amount of u-waste they may
25 need for convenient hours for the population. And --

1 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: The only one we're paying
2 for their increased hours of operation?

3 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: I don't know that
4 we're necessarily paying for the increased hours of
5 operation. That could be we put down a description of
6 what the project is. Because it is an expansion with the
7 onset of u-waste coming on, that means a lot more
8 consumers will be visiting these facilities because they
9 normally would throw it in their garbage. Now they have
10 to take it to the landfill. They're trying to make it
11 more convenient for the constituent groups. So it may not
12 necessarily be a project of funding their extended hours,
13 but the expansion itself. And because of the expansion of
14 the building, they're putting resources into expanded
15 hours.

16 So we just mention that. But we can look into it
17 and see if we are truly funding it. But we could have
18 mentioned that as part of their project.

19 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: I have a couple lines, but I
20 guess my other question then was for collection events.
21 Like in Siskiyou County, collection to me -- also that's
22 not an infrastructure or it's not a take-it-back
23 partnership to pay for a collection event.

24 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: That is one of our
25 modes, temporary. We have temporary events. We have

1 mobile events. We have permanent facilities. And we have
2 curbside. That's another mode of collection we've always
3 supported.

4 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Yeah. But I thought this
5 time we were supposed to emphasize infrastructure
6 activities, including new facilities planning and design
7 and innovative targeted partnership for collections.

8 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: And u-waste
9 collection.

10 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: And partnerships for
11 collections. I thought that's what we were supposed to be
12 focusing on. And to me just conducting 18 events is not
13 really --

14 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: Which one is that,
15 Cheryl?

16 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: It's Siskiyou. I'm not sure
17 the best use of funds is for them to expand. Their use of
18 funds, it might be better in such a rural community to
19 have 18 collection sites that expand their u-waste
20 collection rather than, you know, \$100,000 into a building
21 that people won't be able to get to.

22 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: I thought Lassen County was
23 rural too. But Lassen they want to construct four new
24 household hazardous waste facilities for the same amount
25 for --

1 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: It depends on the
2 population of the area.

3 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Lassen County, I thought
4 their population was like 35,000 people, and they're going
5 to construct four new household hazard waste facilities.
6 In Siskiyou County, they're going to spend all their money
7 on 18 events that will go away.

8 MR. BINNING: Lassen, that's probably not an
9 accurate description. They're actually building one
10 facility and three satellites which could be, I'm
11 guessing, a lot smaller. Siskiyou has a permanent site.
12 What they're proposing was to do about half of the kind of
13 a u-waste but we'll take everything event, half of them at
14 the permanent site and half of them at a transfer station
15 in another part of the county. That was their proposal.

16 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: They didn't think trying to
17 do some partner -- take-it-back partnerships would be
18 better than these collection events? I thought that's
19 what we were trying to encourage.

20 MR. BINNING: I can look at their scoring. Like
21 I said, we give bonus points for projects in those
22 criteria, the design, the construction partnerships.
23 That's not to say a grantee can't score high enough on all
24 the other elements to be awarded or passing, we'll say,
25 without doing one of those projects. That might be the

1 case on this applicant.

2 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: It seems to me if we're
3 trying to encourage things to be there in the future, we
4 would try to encourage the partnerships that would
5 continue the structure and continue -- and not just pay
6 for collection events that would be done this year and
7 then they have nothing.

8 MR. BINNING: I understand.

9 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: They would have things for
10 following years. That was my concern. Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Member Petersen.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PETERSEN: Thank you, Madam
13 Chair.

14 Do you think we can get a more detailed accurate
15 description of each of those things before the Board
16 meeting so we can clearly understand where we're going
17 here?

18 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: We can do that.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER PETERSEN: Would you, please?
20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Any other questions?

22 Can I have a motion on the first Resolution?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Madam Chair, I'd like to
24 move Resolution 2006-141.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Do I have a second?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PETERSEN: I'll second that.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: It's been moved by Member
3 Mulé and seconded by Member Petersen.

4 Kristen, can you call the roll?

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Mulé?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Aye.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Petersen?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PETERSEN: Aye.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Brown?

10 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Aye.

11 Mr. Block, if we have clarification, additional
12 information coming to the Board, can this still be put on
13 fiscal consent?

14 STAFF COUNSEL BLOCK: You absolutely can put it
15 on fiscal consent, because there will still be a small
16 presentation.

17 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Thank you. We'll put that on
18 fiscal consent.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Madam Chair, move
20 Resolution 2006-148 Revised.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PETERSEN: I'll second that.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: It's been moved by Member
23 Mulé and seconded by Member Petersen.

24 Kristen, can you call the roll?

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Mulé?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Aye.

2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Petersen?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PETERSEN: Aye.

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Brown?

5 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Aye.

6 That will be on fiscal consent as well.

7 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: There's two
8 Resolutions.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: We did both. We did 141 and
10 148 Revised.

11 There's another Resolution with the next item, so
12 start on that one. Not that I'm in a hurry, but let's
13 keep this moving. I have some place to be this afternoon.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Madam Chair, do you have
15 somewhere to go?

16 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: No place.

17 ACTING BRANCH MANAGER YEE: Committee Item C,
18 Board Item, 2 is Consideration of Grant Award for the
19 Targeted Asphalt Tire Recycling Management Fund, Fiscal
20 Year 2006-07.

21 As you know, the use of RAC or rubberized asphalt
22 concrete is one of the lynch pins in the Board's effort to
23 significantly increase the diversion and recycling of
24 waste tires. It's designed to provide additional
25 financial incentive to encourage use of products by these

1 local jurisdictions that have no experience using it.
2 Awards for these targeted RAC grants come before the Board
3 on a monthly basis pursuant to the process approved by the
4 Board at the February Board meeting.

5 I will now ask Nate Gauff to make the remainder
6 of the staff presentation and identify the project we
7 propose for funding this month.

8 MR. GAUFF: Good morning, Madam Chair, Committee
9 members, and Board members. I'm Nate Gauff with the
10 Special Waste Division. I will keep this very brief.

11 In this iteration of the grant consideration for
12 the targeted program, we've got four applicants that we
13 are bringing forward recommending for award. They are all
14 requesting \$175,000 in that they're all northern
15 jurisdictions and non-rural counties. They are the City
16 of Alameda, City of Brentwood, City of Huron, and City of
17 Parlier. And we're recommending that all these be
18 approved for award. Any questions?

19 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: I don't think are there any
20 questions.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: No, Madam Chair. But I
22 do want to make a comment. I was at the LEA conference
23 last week and again getting comments from the public on
24 their appreciation of this grant program that we have. So
25 just wanted to let staff know that. Thank you. And with

1 that --

2 BOARD MEMBER WIGGINS: I have a question.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Okay. Member Wiggins.

4 BOARD MEMBER WIGGINS: Yeah. What can you do
5 with \$175,000?

6 MR. GAUFF: For these grants, they are once again
7 designed to pay the differential cost of using rubberized
8 asphalt in lieu of conventional material. So, for
9 example, if a jurisdiction had a \$30 a ton differential
10 and a 4,000 ton project, that would result in \$120,000 of
11 additional cost they normally would not have incurred. So
12 the grant would cover that. And that's primarily what
13 those grants are designed to do is to cover the
14 differential cost.

15 However, if there are additional funds within the
16 maximum grant award, we will also allow them to offset
17 some of their testing costs, pre-testing for the project
18 and also their quality assurance quality control costs
19 while they're doing construction.

20 BOARD MEMBER WIGGINS: And generally these are
21 \$175,000 grants no matter what size their project is,
22 that's what they get?

23 MR. GAUFF: No. What happens is we have -- a lot
24 of jurisdictions don't know what their final differential
25 cost is going to be. So a lot of times they will request

1 the maximum amount. However, when it comes down to when
2 the project is completed, we will pay based on the
3 tonnage, the differential cost, and the testing cost. And
4 if it comes below what they requested, then they're going
5 to get paid what the actual costs were, not the requested
6 amount.

7 BOARD MEMBER WIGGINS: Thank you. That's
8 helpful.

9 MR. GAUFF: Okay.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Thank you, Nate.

11 Anybody have any other questions?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Madam Chair, I'd like to
13 move Resolution 2006-144 Revised.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER PETERSEN: I'll second that.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: It's been moved by Member
16 Mulé and seconded by Member Petersen.

17 Kristen, call the roll.

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Mulé?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MULÉ: Aye.

20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Petersen?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PETERSEN: Aye.

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY GARNER: Brown?

23 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Aye.

24 And we'll put that on fiscal consent too.

25 Do we have any other items? Business? We'll

1 adjourn this meeting. Thank you.

2 (Thereupon the California Integrated Waste
3 Management Board, Special Waste Committee
4 adjourned at 10:37 a.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, TIFFANY C. KRAFT, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter of the State of California, and Registered
4 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
6 foregoing hearing was reported in shorthand by me,
7 Tiffany C. Kraft, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the
8 State of California, and thereafter transcribed into
9 typewriting.

10 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
11 attorney for any of the parties to said hearing nor in any
12 way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
14 this 23rd day August, 2006.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 TIFFANY C. KRAFT, CSR, RPR
24 Certified Shorthand Reporter
25 License No. 12277